

Attorney Docket No.: 1247 P 160
Serial No.: 09/729,996
Page 2

Remarks

Claims 1-32 are pending in the present Application. Claims 12-16 and 18-32 were previously amended in a Preliminary Amendment.

In the September 27, 2002 Office Action, the Examiner entered a restriction requirement which necessitates an election of one of the following groups of claims:

Group I: claims 1-28

Group II: claims 29-31¹

In its Response to the Office Action, Applicant traversed the restriction requirement on the grounds that the Examiner has not established a prima facie case for restricting claims 1-32. In the event the Examiner maintained the restriction requirement, Applicant elected to prosecute the claims of Group I (claims 1-28 and 32) withdraw the claims of Group II (claims 29-31). Given the text of the present Office Action, it appears that the Examiner has recognized Applicant's election to prosecute Group I claims.

On page two of the September 27th Office Action, the Examiner further divided Group I in the following species and required selection for further prosecution:

Group III: Figures 1-16 and 26-29

Group IV: Figures 17-25

¹ Applicant notes that the Examiner has indicated that thirty-two (32) claims are pending and subject to restriction. However, only thirty-one (31) claims have been grouped for restriction purposes. Since independent claim 32 is directed to a tilt-latch, and not a system or method of assembling a tilt-latch (like claims 29-31), Applicant assumes that claim 32 falls within Group I.

Attorney Docket No.: 1247 P 160
Serial No.: 09/729,996
Page 3

Group V: Figures 30 and 31

Applicant again traversed the above grouping of species. Applicant indicated a willingness to select a *proposed Group VI* which includes Figures 1-16 and 26-31. Proposed Group VI corresponds to claims 1-28 and 32. Applicant submits that Group VI is the appropriate sub-group of Group I to select for prosecution because all of the Figures within Group VI disclose consistent aspects or characteristics of the invention as claimed. Applicant further submits that Group VI would not present the Examiner with an unreasonable search and examination of the Application.

In the event the Examiner maintains the species requirement and rejects the proposed Group VI, Applicant selects Group III. Group III corresponds to claims 1-10 and 32.

Attorney Docket No.: 1247 P 160
Serial No.: 09/729,996
Page 4

Conclusion

Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned attorney if the Examiner has any questions concerning this Response, or if it will expedite the progress of this Application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 14, 2003

By: Peter M. Siavelis
Peter M. Siavelis, Registration No. 51,136
Wallenstein & Wagner, Ltd.
311 South Wacker Drive, 53rd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6622
Phone: 312/554-3300
Fax: 312/554-3301

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this document is being facsimile transmitted to Examiner Gregory J. Strimbu, Art Unit No. 3634, at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on February 14, 2003 to Fax No. 703.305.3597.

Lynda K. Johnson
Lynda K. Johnson
/167661.1